On the ADM charges of multiple black holes

István Rácz

Wigner Research Center for Physics, H-1121 Budapest, Hungary

Abstract

Initial data sets of multiple black hole systems are considered. The parabolic-hyperbolic form of the constraints and superposed Kerr-Schild black holes are used to determine them. It is shown that the ADM charges of the yielded multiple black hole configurations are pairwise equal to the ADM charges of the corresponding superposed Kerr-Schild systems.

arXiv:1608.02283v4 [gr-qc] 6 Feb 2017

1 Introduction

Binary black holes are considered to be the foremost important sources for the emerging field of gravitational wave astrophysics. Multiple black hole systems, above obvious curiosities, may also serve as exotic gravitational waves sources. Investigation of the dynamics of these systems requires a judicious initialization. This may be done by the standard elliptic method [11, 12] (see also [4, 6]) or by either of the recently introduced evolutionary approaches [13] that are complementary to the standard one.

Recently, the parabolic-hyperbolic formulation of Hamiltonian and momentum constraints, along with superposing individual Kerr-Schild black holes, was applied to construct initial data for binary black hole configurations [14]. This construction does also apply to multiple black hole systems comprised by black holes with initial speeds parallel to a plane in some background Euclidean space provided that their spins are orthogonal to that plane. As there are no restrictions on the masses, speeds, spins and distances of the individual black holes, this set contains a great number of systems of physical interest. For this class of configurations an argument claiming the existence and uniqueness of (at least) C^2 solutions to the parabolic-hyperbolic form of the constraints is outlined in [14].

In this paper a different strategy will be applied. We shall consider a set of generic individual Kerr-Schild black holes, each located momentarily on a plane in some background Euclidean space but the orientation of their speeds and spins will not be restricted. By adopting constructive elements of the proposal in [14], we shall choose the free data to the initial-boundary value problem, derived from the parabolic-hyperbolic form of the constraints, using the metric yielded by superposing Kerr-Schild black holes. Note that in case of widely separated generic Kerr-Schild black holes solutions to the initial-boundary problem are expected to differ only slightly

from the individual black holes solutions, whence it is highly plausible that in these cases the craved global solutions exist. Nevertheless, as the verification of the basic result of the present paper refers only to the specific choice of the free data and it does not require the detailed knowledge of solutions, no attempt will be made here to deal with the global existence and uniqueness of solutions to the pertinent initial-boundary value problem. Instead, provided that free data is chosen as proposed in [14], the global existence of asymptotically flat solutions to this initial-boundary value problem will simply be assumed.

As the metric (2.24) of superposed Kerr-Schild black holes is asymptotically flat [14]—though it does not satisfy Einstein's equations—it is plausible to assume that solutions to the specific initial-boundary problem will also be asymptotically flat. As a working hypothesis we shall assume this, and also that well-defined ADM mass, center of mass, linear and angular momenta can be associated with the corresponding asymptotically flat solutions.

Based on these assumptions, this paper is to prove that the ADM quantities, characterizing initializations of the underlying multiple black hole systems, can be given—without making detailed use of the to be solutions to the constraints—in terms of the rest masses, positions, velocities and spins of the individual black holes.

This result immediately raises the question whether any analogous determination of the ADM quantities is available in other formulations of the constraints. In this respect, it should be mentioned that the method proposed by Bowen and York [3], within the framework of conformal approach, allows to prescribe the ADM linear and angular momenta by solving the momentum constraint explicitly [3, 2]. However, to do so they had to apply a restricted set of basic variables. In particular, to guarantee that the Hamiltonian and momentum constraints decouple they had to assume vanishing of the mean curvature while other technical ingredients required conformal flatness of the Riemannian metric h_{ij}. One of the unpleasant consequences of these technical assumptions is that they are known to be so strong that they exclude even the Kerr black hole solution from the outset [7, 10]. One should also mention here that, within the setup proposed by Bowen and York [3], there was no way to get an analogous control on the ADM mass or on the center of mass.

In context of the determinacy of the ADM quantities one should also mention the construction applied in [6]. There, by combining the gluing techniques with the use of Kerr-Schild black holes, an interesting initialization of multiple black hole systems was proposed. Indeed, as Kerr-Schild black holes were applied in [6] and our proposal also makes heavy use of the these types of black holes one would expect that analogous determinacy of the ADM quantities applies to both of these approaches. It is, however, not the case, as gluing requires the use of the elliptic method that starts by a conformal rescaling of the basic variables. In turn, gluing gets somewhat implicit,

which does not allow—except in the highly unrealistic extremal case with infinitely separated individual black holes—to have a full control on the ADM quantities [6]. Yet another unfavorable consequence of the use of conformal method is that intermediate regions—where the gluing happens—have to be allocated to each of the involved Kerr-Schild black holes. This, however, does not allow to set the initial distances of these black holes to be arbitrary, and, as stated explicitly in [6], they must be separated by a distance above a certain threshold.

It is important to emphasize that our proposal does not impose analogous restrictions on the distances of individual black holes, and yet it provides a full control on the ADM parameters of multiple black hole systems. As this happens in advance of solving the constraints, an unprecedented fine tuning of the full set of ADM parameters of the to be solutions is possible.

The main result of this paper reads as follows:

Theorem 1 *Suppose that an asymptotically flat solution to the initial-boundary value problem—deduced from the parabolic-hyperbolic form of the constrains, (2.6)–(2.8)—exist such that the free data is chosen, as described in section 3, by applying the superposed Kerr-Schild metric (2.24). Then, the ADM mass, center of mass, linear and angular momenta, relevant for the initialization of the corresponding multiple black hole system, can be given, as in (4.1)–(4.4), in terms of the rest masses, positions, velocities and spins of the involved Kerr-Schild black holes.*

It is important to be emphasized that the argument ensuring the existence and uniqueness of (at least) C^2 solutions to the parabolic-hyperbolic form of the constraints for the restricted class of configurations investigated in [14]—or the one applied above to widely separated generic multi black holes—indicates that non-trivial multi black hole systems fitting to the assumptions of Theorem 1 exist guaranteeing thereby that the above hypotheses are not empty.

2 Preliminaries

Initial data relevant for the vacuum Einstein's equations is comprised by a Riemannian metric h_{ij} and a symmetric tensor field K_{ij}. Both of these fields are assumed to be given on a three-dimensional manifold Σ. They are, however, non-generic as they have to satisfy the constraints. These, in the vacuum case—relevant also for multiple black hole configurations considered in this paper—, are given as (see, e.g. [4])

$$ {}^{(3)}R + \left(K^j{}_j\right)^2 - K_{ij}K^{ij} = 0 \tag{2.1} $$

$$ D_j K^j{}_i - D_i K^j{}_j = 0\,, \tag{2.2} $$

where ${}^{(3)}R$ and D_i denote the scalar curvature and the covariant derivative operator associated with h_{ij}, respectively.

2.1 The parabolic-hyperbolic form of constraints

The essential steps in deriving the parabolic-hyperbolic form of these equations are as follows: Assume, for simplicity, that there exists a smooth function $\rho : \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ such that the $\rho = const$ surfaces (denoted also by $\mathscr{S}_\rho$) provide a one-parameter family of foliation of Σ. This allows to define the transversal one form $D_i\rho$ to these level surfaces throughout Σ.

Choose then a vector field ρ^i on Σ such that $\rho^i\partial_i\rho = 1$, and consider its parallel and orthogonal parts

$$\rho^i = \widehat{N}\,\widehat{n}^i + \widehat{N}^i\,, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\widehat{N}$ and $\widehat{N}^i$ stand for the lapse and shift of ρ^i, respectively.

Analogous decompositions of the metric h_{ij} and the symmetric tensor field K_{ij} are

$$h_{ij} = \widehat{\gamma}_{ij} + \widehat{n}_i\widehat{n}_j\,, \quad \text{and} \quad K_{ij} = \boldsymbol{\kappa}\,\widehat{n}_i\widehat{n}_j + [\widehat{n}_i\,\mathbf{k}_j + \widehat{n}_j\,\mathbf{k}_i] + \mathbf{K}_{ij}\,, \tag{2.4}$$

where the tensorial part $\mathbf{K}_{ij}$ of K_{ij} may also be replaced by its trace and trace free parts

$$\mathbf{K}^l{}_l = \widehat{\gamma}^{kl}\,\mathbf{K}_{kl} \quad \text{and} \quad \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{K}}_{ij} = \mathbf{K}_{ij} - \tfrac{1}{2}\,\widehat{\gamma}_{ij}\,\mathbf{K}^l{}_l\,. \tag{2.5}$$

Using the new variables $\widehat{N}, \widehat{N}^i, \widehat{\gamma}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{k}_i, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{K}}_{ij}, \mathbf{K}^l{}_l$ the constraints—when they are intended to be solved for $\widehat{N}, \mathbf{k}_i$ and $\mathbf{K}^l{}_l$—can be seen to be equivalent to the parabolic-hyperbolic system [13]

$$\overset{\star}{K}\,[\,(\partial_\rho\widehat{N}) - \widehat{N}^l(\widehat{D}_l\widehat{N})\,] = \widehat{N}^2(\widehat{D}^l\widehat{D}_l\widehat{N}) + \mathcal{A}\,\widehat{N} + \mathcal{B}\,\widehat{N}^3\,, \tag{2.6}$$

$$\mathscr{L}_{\widehat{n}}\mathbf{k}_i - \tfrac{1}{2}\,\widehat{D}_i(\mathbf{K}^l{}_l) - \widehat{D}_i\boldsymbol{\kappa} + \widehat{D}^l\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{K}}_{li} + \widehat{N}\overset{\star}{K}\,\mathbf{k}_i + [\,\boldsymbol{\kappa} - \tfrac{1}{2}\,(\mathbf{K}^l{}_l)\,]\,\dot{\widehat{n}}_i - \dot{\widehat{n}}^l\,\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{K}}_{li} = 0 \tag{2.7}$$

$$\mathscr{L}_{\widehat{n}}(\mathbf{K}^l{}_l) - \widehat{D}^l\mathbf{k}_l - \widehat{N}\overset{\star}{K}\,[\,\boldsymbol{\kappa} - \tfrac{1}{2}\,(\mathbf{K}^l{}_l)\,] + \widehat{N}\,\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{K}}_{kl}\overset{\star}{K}{}^{kl} + 2\,\dot{\widehat{n}}^l\,\mathbf{k}_l = 0\,. \tag{2.8}$$

Here, $\widehat{D}_i$ denotes the covariant derivative operator associated with $\widehat{\gamma}_{ij}$ and

$$\overset{\star}{K}_{ij} = \tfrac{1}{2}\mathscr{L}_\rho\widehat{\gamma}_{ij} - \widehat{D}_{(i}\widehat{N}_{j)}\,, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\overset{\star}{K} = \tfrac{1}{2}\,\widehat{\gamma}^{ij}\mathscr{L}_\rho\widehat{\gamma}_{ij} - \widehat{D}_j\widehat{N}^j\,, \tag{2.10}$$

$$\mathcal{A} = (\partial_\rho\overset{\star}{K}) - \widehat{N}^l(\widehat{D}_l\overset{\star}{K}) + \tfrac{1}{2}[\,\overset{\star}{K}{}^2 + \overset{\star}{K}_{kl}\overset{\star}{K}{}^{kl}\,] \tag{2.11}$$

$$\mathcal{B} = -\tfrac{1}{2}\left[\widehat{R} + 2\,\boldsymbol{\kappa}\,(\mathbf{K}^l{}_l) + \tfrac{1}{2}\,(\mathbf{K}^l{}_l)^2 - 2\,\mathbf{k}^l\mathbf{k}_l - \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{K}}_{kl}\,\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{K}}{}^{kl}\right] \tag{2.12}$$

$$\dot{\widehat{n}}_k = \widehat{n}^l D_l\widehat{n}_k = -\widehat{D}_k(\ln\widehat{N})\,. \tag{2.13}$$

The variables $\widehat{N}^i, \widehat{\gamma}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ and $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{K}}_{ij}$ are unconstrained whence they are freely specifiable throughout Σ. The well-posedness of the coupled system (2.6)–(2.8) is guaranteed if (2.6) is uniformly parabolic. It was shown in [13] that this happens in those

subregions of Σ where $\overset{\star}{K}$ is either strictly positive or negative. Furthermore, as $\overset{\star}{K}$ depends on the freely specifiable fields $\widehat{\gamma}_{ij}$ and $\widehat{N}^i$ exclusively, its sign (at least locally) is adjustable according to the needs of specific problems to be solved [13, 14].

Note that, in addition to the freely specifiable variables, on one of the $\rho = const$ level surfaces initial data has also to be chosen for the constrained variables [13]. Once this has been done, i.e. smooth data has been chosen for $\widehat{N}, \mathbf{k}_i$ and $\mathbf{K}^l{}_l$, then unique smooth solution exists to (2.6)–(2.8) in the domain of dependence of that $\rho = const$ level surface. It is also important that the fields h_{ij} and K_{ij} that can be reconstructed from such a solution, and from the freely specifiable fields, do satisfy the Hamiltonian and momentum constraints (2.1) and (2.2).

2.2 Asymptotic flattness and the ADM quantities

Before restricting our considerations to a specific class of solutions to the parabolic-hyperbolic system (2.6)–(2.8), it is rewarding to recall the generic notion of asymptotic flatness, along with the conditions ensuring the ADM charges—such as the mass, center of mass, linear and angular momenta—to be well-defined.

As our model is based on the superposed Kerr-Schild metric, it will suffice to assume the existence of a single asymptotically flat end complementing a finite ball $\mathscr{B}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ that hosts the singularities of the superposed multiple black hole system. (See section 3 below for further specifications.)

The initial data set (Σ, h_{ij}, K_{ij}) is called asymptotically Euclidean [6], to order ℓ, if in the exterior $\Sigma \setminus \mathscr{B}$ asymptoticly flat admissible coordinates $x_i = (x, y, z)$ exist such that [1]

$$\big|\, \partial^\alpha \big(\, h_{ij} - \delta_{ij} \,\big)(\vec{x}) \,\big| = \mathcal{O}(\, |\vec{x}|^{-|\alpha|-1} \,), \quad \big|\, \partial^\beta K_{ij}(\vec{x}) \,\big| = \mathcal{O}(\, |\vec{x}|^{-|\beta|-2} \,), \tag{2.14}$$

hold, where $|\vec{x}| = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2}$, and where ∂^α, with multi index $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$, stands for the composition of partial derivative operators $\partial_{x_1}^{\alpha_1} \partial_{x_2}^{\alpha_2} \partial_{x_3}^{\alpha_3}$, and for the multi indices α and β, for some value of ℓ, the inequalities $|\alpha| \leq \ell + 1$ and $|\beta| \leq \ell$ hold. For the arguments applied in this paper $\ell \geq 1$ will suffice. In most cases the operators ∂_{x_i} will also be abbreviated as ∂_i.

It is known, that conditions in (2.14) can only guarantee the existence and finiteness of the four-momentum, and to have, in addition, well-defined center of mass and

[1] Note that as the argument applied in Section 4—likewise in many analogous investigations (see, e.g. [5])—it is not quite necessary to require full power over the decay of the quantities involved. Nevertheless, for convenience here and elsewhere those stronger forms of the fall off conditions will be used that for sure guarantee the results to hold.

angular momentum the so-called Regge-Teitelboim asymptotic parity conditions need to be used which, in admissible coordinates, can be given as

$$\big|\,\partial^{\alpha}\big(\,h_{ij}(\vec{x})-h_{ij}(-\vec{x})\,\big)\,\big|=\mathcal{O}(\,|\vec{x}|^{-|\alpha|-2}\,),\quad \big|\,\partial^{\beta}\big(\,K_{ij}(\vec{x})-K_{ij}(-\vec{x})\,\big)\,\big|=\mathcal{O}(\,|\vec{x}|^{-|\beta|-3}\,)\,. \tag{2.15}$$

Assuming that both the asymptotic flatness and the Regge-Teitelboim conditions hold, the ADM mass, center of mass, linear and angular momenta are given by the flux integrals [6]

$$M^{\,ADM}=\frac{1}{16\pi}\oint_{\infty}\left[\,\partial_i h_{ij}-\partial_j h_{ii}\,\right]n^j\mathrm{d}S \tag{2.16}$$

$$M^{\,ADM}d_i=\frac{1}{16\pi}\oint_{\infty}\Big\{x_i\left[\,\partial_k h_{kj}-\partial_j h_{kk}\,\right]-\left[\,h_{kj}\,\delta^{k}{}_{i}-h_{kk}\,\delta_{ij}\,\right]\Big\}n^j\mathrm{d}S \tag{2.17}$$

$$P_i^{\,ADM}=\frac{1}{8\pi}\oint_{\infty}\left[\,K_{ij}-h_{kj}\,K^{l}{}_{l}\,\right]n^j\mathrm{d}S \tag{2.18}$$

$$J_i^{\,ADM}=\frac{1}{8\pi}\oint_{\infty}\left[\,K_{kj}-h_{kj}\,K^{l}{}_{l}\,\right]\,\epsilon_i{}^{lk}x_l\,n^j\mathrm{d}S\,, \tag{2.19}$$

where the symbol $\oint_{\infty}$ is meant to denote limits of integrals over spheres while their radii tend to infinity, whereas n^i and $\mathrm{d}S$ denote the outward normal and the volume element of the individual spheres of the sequences, respectively. Note that in (2.19) $\epsilon_i{}^{jk}x_j$ stands for the components of the three rotational Killing vector fields, defined with respect to the applied admissible asymptotically Euclidean coordinates x_i.

2.3 Superposed Kerr-Schild black holes

Before superposing Kerr-Schild black holes recall first that a single Kerr black hole [8] possesses the Kerr-Schild form

$$g_{\alpha\beta}=\eta_{\alpha\beta}+2H\ell_\alpha\ell_\beta\,, \tag{2.20}$$

where

$$H=\frac{r^3M}{r^4+a^2z^2}\quad\text{and}\quad \ell_\alpha=\left(1,\frac{r\,x+a\,y}{r^2+a^2},\frac{r\,y-a\,x}{r^2+a^2},\frac{z}{r}\right)\,, \tag{2.21}$$

and where the Boyer-Lindquist radial coordinate r is related to the spatial part of the inertial coordinates $x^\alpha=(t,x,y,z)$—which obviously are asymptotically flat admissible coordinates—via the implicit relation

$$\frac{x^2+y^2}{r^2+a^2}+\frac{z^2}{r^2}=1\,. \tag{2.22}$$

It is well-known that generic displaced, boosted and spinning black holes can be produced by performing suitable Poincaré transformations on a Kerr black hole. It

is also important that the Kerr-Schild metric is form-invariant under these transformations. In particular, even if a Lorentz transformation $x'^{\alpha} = \Lambda^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}\, x^{\beta}$ is performed the metric $g'_{\alpha\beta}$ in the new coordinates will possess the Kerr-Schild form $g'_{\alpha\beta} = \eta_{\alpha\beta} + 2H'\ell'_{\alpha}\ell'_{\beta}$ with

$$H'(x'^{\alpha}) = H\left([\Lambda^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}]^{-1}x'^{\beta}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell'_{\beta}(x'^{\varepsilon}) = \Lambda^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}\,\ell_{\alpha}\left([\Lambda^{\varepsilon}{}_{\varphi}]^{-1}x'^{\varphi}\right). \tag{2.23}$$

As boosts and spatial rotations are special Lorentz transformations it is straightforward to construct models of moving black holes with preferably oriented speed and spin by performing suitable combinations of boosts and rotations on a Kerr black hole that is in rest with respect to an auxiliary Minkowski background. Note also that displacement of these boosted and spinning black holes may be represented by a trivial transformation of the argument of H and ℓ_{α} whence all the generic displaced, boosted and spinning individual black holes may be produced by the outlined process.

Now we are almost ready to combine the parabolic-hyperbolic form of the constraints with superposed Kerr-Schild black holes. As indicated in the introduction solving the constraints in their parabolic-hyperbolic form (2.6)–(2.8) requires specifications of the unconstrained variables $\widehat{N}^i, \widehat{\gamma}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ and $\mathring{\mathbf{K}}_{ij}$ everywhere on Σ, and, in addition, an initialization of constrained variables $\widehat{N}, \mathbf{k}_i$ and $\mathbf{K}^l{}_l$ on one of the $\rho = const$ level surfaces.

As it was verified in [14] it is rewarding to use the auxiliary metric

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = \eta_{\alpha\beta} + \sum_{I=1}^{N} 2\, H^{[I]}\ell_{\alpha}{}^{[I]}\ell_{\beta}{}^{[I]} \tag{2.24}$$

yielded by superposing the contributions of individual black holes, where $H^{[I]}$ and $\ell_i{}^{[I]}$ correspond to the Kerr-Schild data for individual black holes. This metric retains much of the algebraic simplicity of (2.20). For instance, the vector fields $\ell^{\alpha[I]}$ remain null with respect to the background Minkowski metric, and they satisfy the geodesic equation $\ell^{\beta[I]}\partial_{\beta}\,\ell^{\alpha[I]} = 0$, the functions $H^{[I]}$ satisfy the background wave equation $\eta^{\alpha\beta}\partial_{\alpha}\partial_{\beta}H^{[I]} = 0$ (see, e.g. [15]).

From now on, to distinguish the truly physical quantities from the ones deduced from superimposed Kerr-Schild form (2.24), the latter will be labeled by the "pre upper index" ${}^{(A)}$. For instance, ${}^{(A)}h_{ij}$ will stand for the three-metric

$${}^{(A)}h_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + \sum_{I=1}^{N} 2\, H^{[I]}\ell_i{}^{[I]}\ell_j{}^{[I]} \tag{2.25}$$

induced by the superposed Kerr-Schild form (2.24) on $t = const$ hypersurfaces, where t is the time coordinate of the inertial system $x^{\alpha} = (t, x, y, z)$. Clearly, such a $t =$

const hypersurface may be assumed to be a Kerr-Schild time slice for each of the individual black holes, which implies that topologically it is simply the complement of the individual singularities in $\mathbb{R}^3$ as it was indicated in section 2.2.

Note that even though the metric (2.24) is not a solution to Einstein's equations the spacetime determined by it is asymptotically flat. This means, in particular, that the error to be a solution is so small that the integrability of the scalar curvature of ${}^{(A)}h_{ij}$ (necessary for the well-definedness, for instance, of the ADM mass [1]) is still guaranteed, and that conditions in (2.14) and (2.15) hold for (2.24), and, in turn, well-defined ADM charges can be associated with superposed Kerr-Schild black holes. These quantities can be determined either by evaluating the flux integrals given in (2.16)–(2.19) or by taking into account the Poincaré transformations associated with displacements, boosts and rotations performed on the individual black holes. In either way we get the remarkably simple relations

$$M^{ADM} = \sum_{I=1}^{N} \gamma^{[I]} M^{[I]}\,, \tag{2.26}$$

$$M^{ADM}\vec{d} = \sum_{I=1}^{N} \gamma^{[I]} M^{[I]} \vec{d}^{\,[I]} \tag{2.27}$$

$$\vec{P}^{\,ADM} = \sum_{I=1}^{N} \gamma^{[I]} M^{[I]} \vec{v}^{\,[I]}\,, \tag{2.28}$$

$$\vec{J}^{ADM} = \sum_{I=1}^{N} \gamma^{[I]} \left\{ M^{[I]} \vec{d}^{\,[I]} \times \vec{v}^{\,[I]} + M^{[I]} a^{[I]} \vec{s}_{\circ}^{\,[I]} \right\}\,, \tag{2.29}$$

where $\vec{v}^{\,[I]}$ and $\vec{d}^{\,[I]}$ are the velocity and position vectors of the individual black holes with respect to the background inertial frame, and $\vec{s}_{\circ}^{\,[I]}$ denotes the unit vectors pointing to directions of the individual spin vectors.

3 The initial-boundary value problem

In advance of determining the ADM quantities relevant for asymptotically flat multiple black hole configurations one has to make a choice for the free data for the underlying initial-boundary problem. As a preparation for the asymptotic case first, by a straightforward adaptation of the method applied in [14], considerations will be restricted to the finite domain case.

Accordingly, the initial data surface Σ is chosen to be a cube, centered at the origin in $\mathbb{R}^3$ (see Fig. 1) with boundary comprised by six squares each with edges $2A$.



Figure 1: The initial data surface Σ, with a triple black hole system, is chosen to be the cube centered at the origin in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with edges $2A$. The initial data, to the system (2.6)–(2.8), is supposed to be specified on the horizontal squares, at $z = \pm A$, bounding the cube from above and below, whereas boundary values have to be given on the complementary part of the boundary comprised by four vertical squares.

By choosing the value of A sufficiently large all the individual black holes will be contained in this cubical domain with suitable margin. The parabolic-hyperbolic system (2.6)–(2.8) has to be solved then as an initial-boundary value problem to which (local) well-posedness is guaranteed (see, e.g. [9]) in those subregions of Σ where (2.6) is uniformly parabolic.

As in [14], the individual black holes are assumed to be located momentarily on the $z = 0$ plane in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and a foliation of Σ by $z = const$ level surfaces will be applied. Then, by an argument, slightly generalizing the one applied in [14], the principal coefficient $\overset{\star}{K}$ of the parabolic equation (2.6) can be shown to vanish on a smooth surface dividing Σ into two disjoint subsets. This follows from the fact that $\overset{\star}{K}$ depends on the freely specifiable part of the data, whereby it may be guaranteed to be smooth and, for sufficiently large value of A, negative on the $z = A$ plane while positive on the $z = -A$ plane. The singularities are located on this $\overset{\star}{K} = 0$ surface and apart from sufficiently small neighborhoods of these singularities the $\overset{\star}{K} = 0$ surface coincides with the $z = 0$ plane. Then (2.6) is uniformly parabolic on the disjunct subregions of Σ located above and below the $\overset{\star}{K} = 0$ surface, and one could also

investigate the well-posedness of the parabolic-hyperbolic system (2.6)–(2.8) in these subregions. Nevertheless, as indicated in the introduction, instead of attempting to do so we shall simply assume that global existence and uniqueness of solutions to the considered initial-boundary value problems, along with their proper matching, is guaranteed. Note that the pertinent initial values are supposed to be specified on the horizontal $z = \pm A$ squares, whereas the boundary values have to be given on the four vertical sides of the cube (see Fig. 1).

3.1 The asymptotic properties of the initial-boundary data

In motivating the requirements concerning the asymptotic properties of the initial-boundary data it is rewarding to inspect limits of sequences of solutions on finite cubical domains the edges of which, in the limit, tend to infinity. The individual members of such a sequence will differ everywhere from global solution to the constraints. Nevertheless, the deviations are expected to be smaller and smaller as the boundary is pushed further and further away from the central region towards spacelike infinity.

As opposed to the choice we need to make concerning the asymptotic properties of the initial and boundary data, it is fairly straightforward to specify the fields $\widehat{N}^i, \widehat{\gamma}_{ij}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ and $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{K}}_{ij}$ on a $t = const$ hypersurface. This is supposed to be done point-wise by simply adopting the fields ${}^{(A)}\widehat{N}^i$, ${}^{(A)}\widehat{\gamma}_{ij}$, ${}^{(A)}\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ and ${}^{(A)}\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{K}}_{ij}$ [14]. The proper fall off properties of this part of the data is guaranteed by the fact that well-defined ADM quantities can be associated with (2.24). As indicated in the previous sections, the initialization of the constrained variables $\widehat{N}, \mathbf{K}^l{}_l$ and $\mathbf{k}_i$ has also to be done by using the auxiliary metric (2.24) though the deduction of their asymptotic properties requires a lot more care.

Before proceeding let us sum up the implications we already have at hand. Taking into account that the solution was assumed to be asymptotically flat, (2.14) and the Regge-Teitelboim parity conditions (2.15) are also supposed to hold. In particular, the fields $\widehat{N}, \mathbf{K}^l{}_l$ and $\mathbf{k}_i$ are expected to satisfy

$$\left|\partial^\alpha\big(\widehat{N}-1\big)(\vec{x})\right| = \mathcal{O}(|\vec{x}|^{-|\alpha|-1})\,,\ \left|\partial^\beta \mathbf{K}^l{}_l(\vec{x})\right| = \mathcal{O}(|\vec{x}|^{-|\beta|-2})\,,\ \left|\partial^\beta \mathbf{k}_i(\vec{x})\right| = \mathcal{O}(|\vec{x}|^{-|\beta|-2})\,, \tag{3.1}$$

and the parity conditions

$$\left|\,\partial^\alpha\big(\,\widehat{N}(\vec{x}) - \widehat{N}(-\vec{x})\,\big)\,\right| = \mathcal{O}(\,|\vec{x}|^{-|\alpha|-2}\,) \tag{3.2}$$

$$\left|\,\partial^\beta\big(\,\mathbf{K}^l{}_l(\vec{x}) - \mathbf{K}^l{}_l(-\vec{x})\,\big)\,\right| = \mathcal{O}(\,|\vec{x}|^{-|\beta|-3}\,) \tag{3.3}$$

$$\left|\,\partial^\beta\big(\,\mathbf{k}_i(\vec{x}) - \mathbf{k}_i(-\vec{x})\,\big)\,\right| = \mathcal{O}(\,|\vec{x}|^{-|\beta|-3}\,)\,. \tag{3.4}$$

Since the ADM quantities are well-defined for the superposed Kerr-Schild configurations, the auxiliary fields ${}^{(A)}\widehat{N}, {}^{(A)}\mathbf{K}^l{}_l$ and ${}^{(A)}\mathbf{k}_i$ do also satisfy conditions analogous to (3.1)-(3.4).

Consider now the asymptotic expansions of the constrained fields $\widehat{N}, \mathbf{K}^l{}_l$ and $\mathbf{k}_i$ and those of the corresponding auxiliary fields ${}^{(A)}\widehat{N}, {}^{(A)}\mathbf{K}^l{}_l$ and ${}^{(A)}\mathbf{k}_i$ given in terms of various powers of $1/|\vec{x}|^n$, with integer $n > 0$. Referring to what we have inferred concerning sequences of solutions defined on finite cubical domains, it is plausible to assume that as the boundaries of these domains are pushed further and further towards spacelike infinity higher than the leading order terms of the asymptotic expansion play less and less role. Therefore, as the only sensible asymptotic behavior of the fields $\widehat{N}, \mathbf{K}^l{}_l$ and $\mathbf{k}_i$ associated with the pertinent asymptotically flat solution, the leading order terms in their asymptotic expansions are assumed to be equal to those of ${}^{(A)}\widehat{N}, {}^{(A)}\mathbf{K}^l{}_l$ and ${}^{(A)}\mathbf{k}_i$, respectively. Obviously, all the higher order contributions may—and, in general, do indeed—differ from each other. Nevertheless, as the fields $\widehat{N}, \mathbf{K}^l{}_l$, $\mathbf{k}_i$ and ${}^{(A)}\widehat{N}, {}^{(A)}\mathbf{K}^l{}_l$, ${}^{(A)}\mathbf{k}_i$ are assumed to agree at leading order, respectively, their deviations[2] are expected to satisfy the following relations

$$\big|\,\partial^\alpha \Delta[\widehat{N}](\vec{x})\,\big| = \big|\,\partial^\alpha\big(\,\widehat{N} - {}^{(A)}\widehat{N}\,\big)(\vec{x})\,\big| = \mathcal{O}(\,|\vec{x}|^{-|\alpha|-2}\,) \tag{3.5}$$

$$\big|\,\partial^\beta \Delta[\mathbf{K}^l{}_l](\vec{x})\,\big| = \big|\,\partial^\beta\big(\,\mathbf{K}^l{}_l - {}^{(A)}\mathbf{K}^l{}_l\,\big)(\vec{x})\,\big| = \mathcal{O}(\,|\vec{x}|^{-|\beta|-3}\,) \tag{3.6}$$

$$\big|\,\partial^\beta \Delta[\mathbf{k}_i](\vec{x})\,\big| = \big|\,\partial^\beta\big(\,\mathbf{k}_i - {}^{(A)}\mathbf{k}_i\,\big)(\vec{x})\,\big| = \mathcal{O}(\,|\vec{x}|^{-|\beta|-3}\,) \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$\big|\,\partial^\alpha\big\{\Delta[\widehat{N}](\vec{x}) - \Delta[\widehat{N}](-\vec{x})\big\}\,\big| = \mathcal{O}(\,|\vec{x}|^{-|\alpha|-3}\,) \tag{3.8}$$

$$\big|\,\partial^\beta\big\{\Delta[\mathbf{K}^l{}_l](\vec{x}) - \Delta[\mathbf{K}^l{}_l](-\vec{x})\big\}\,\big| = \mathcal{O}(\,|\vec{x}|^{-|\beta|-4}\,) \tag{3.9}$$

$$\big|\,\partial^\beta\big\{\Delta[\mathbf{k}_i](\vec{x}) - \Delta[\mathbf{k}_i](-\vec{x})\big\}\,\big| = \mathcal{O}(\,|\vec{x}|^{-|\beta|-4}\,)\,. \tag{3.10}$$

4 The determination of the ADM quantities

After having all the above fixing of the free data it is of obvious interest to know what is the relation between the ADM quantities relevant for the true asymptotically flat solution of the constraints and the quantities in (2.26)–(2.29). We are prepared now to show that conditions (3.5)-(3.10), along with the choices we made for the other auxiliary variables, guarantee that the two sets of ADM quantities are pairwise equal to each other. In the following subsections a case by case verification of this claim, and, in turn, the proof of Theorem 1 will be provided.

[2]These deviations will be denoted by Δ followed by the pertinent quantities in square brackets, as they are spelled out explicitly in the first two terms of (3.5)–(3.7).

4.1 The ADM mass

Consider first the ADM mass. Start by replacing the flux integral applied in (2.16) by a slightly different flux integral

$$M^{\,ADM} = \frac{1}{16\pi} \!\!\!\!\!\!\int\!\!\!\!\!\!\int\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{\infty} [\,\partial_i h_{ij} - \partial_j h_{ii}\,]\, n^j \mathrm{d}C\,, \tag{4.1}$$

where the symbol $\!\!\!\!\!\!\int\!\!\!\!\!\!\int\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{\infty}$ denotes the limit of integrals over the boundary of a sequence of co-centered cubes while the length of their edges tend to infinity, whereas n^i and $\mathrm{d}C$ denote the outward pointing unit normal vector and the volume element on the squares bounding individual cubes in this sequence.

At the first glance it may not be obvious that the flux integrals over concentric spheres can be replaced by flux integrals over boundaries of co-centered cubical regions. Note, however, that to any individual member of these cubes there always exist a minimal radius sphere that contains the cube, and a maximal radius sphere that is contained by the cube. Clearly, either the minimal or maximal radius of spheres are applied to construct a sequence, the flux integrals defined with respect to them tend to the ADM mass. Thereby, the flux integrals evaluated on the boundaries of the cubes have to tend to the ADM mass as well. Accordingly, the limits of the integrals in (2.16) and (4.2) have to be equal to each other.

Returning to the main line of the argument note that our aim here is to show that the difference $\Delta[M^{\,ADM}] = M^{\,ADM} - {}^{(A)}M^{\,ADM}$ between the ADM mass of the physical solution and that of the superposed Kerr-Schild black holes is zero. To see that this is indeed the case, note first that by virtue of (4.1)

$$\Delta[M^{\,ADM}] = \frac{1}{16\pi} \!\!\!\!\!\!\int\!\!\!\!\!\!\int\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{\infty} \Big[\, \partial_i \left(h_{ij} - {}^{(A)}h_{ij}\right) - \partial_j \left(h_{ii} - {}^{(A)}h_{ii}\right) \Big]\, n^j \, \mathrm{d}C\,. \tag{4.2}$$

Evaluating the integrands we need to determine first the involved derivatives. In doing so we shall need the difference

$$h_{ij} - {}^{(A)}h_{ij} = \widehat{n}_i\, \widehat{n}_j - {}^{(A)}\widehat{n}_i\, {}^{(A)}\widehat{n}_j = \delta_{iz}\delta_{jz}\,(\widehat{N}^2 - {}^{(A)}\widehat{N}^2) = \delta_{iz}\delta_{jz}\,\Delta[\widehat{N}^2]\,, \tag{4.3}$$

yielded by applying the relations

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{ij} = {}^{(A)}\widehat{\gamma}_{ij}, \quad \widehat{n}_i = \widehat{N}\,\delta_{iz} \quad \text{and} \quad {}^{(A)}\widehat{n}_i = {}^{(A)}\widehat{N}\,.\delta_{iz} \tag{4.4}$$

It follows then from (4.3) that

$$\partial_k \left(h_{ij} - {}^{(A)}h_{ij}\right) = \delta_{iz}\delta_{jz}\partial_k \left(\Delta[\widehat{N}^2]\right), \tag{4.5}$$

and also that

$$\partial_i \left(h_{ij} - {}^{(A)}h_{ij} \right) = \delta_{jz} \partial_z \left(\Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_j \left(h_{ii} - {}^{(A)}h_{ii} \right) = \partial_j \left(\Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \right). \tag{4.6}$$

By combining (4.1), (4.2) and (4.6) we get then that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta[M^{\,ADM}] &= \frac{1}{16\pi} \!\!\!\!\!\!\int\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{\infty} \Big[\delta_{jz} \partial_z \left(\Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \right) - \partial_j \left(\Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \right) \Big] \, n^j \, \mathrm{d}C \\ &= -\frac{1}{16\pi} \!\!\!\!\!\!\int\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{\infty} \Big[\partial_x \left(\Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \right) \vec{n}^{\,x}_{\pm} + \partial_y \left(\Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \right) \vec{n}^{\,y}_{\pm} \Big] \, \mathrm{d}C \,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where $\vec{n}^{\,x}_{\pm}$ and $\vec{n}^{\,y}_{\pm}$ denote the outward pointing unit normal vectors to the squares in the $x = \pm A$ and $y = \pm A$ plains, bounding the cubical region on Fig. 1. Since $\vec{n}^{\,x}_{-} = -\vec{n}^{\,x}_{+}$ and $\vec{n}^{\,y}_{-} = -\vec{n}^{\,y}_{+}$, the two terms given explicitly in the integrands stand indeed for four terms.

By applying then the replacements $y \to x\,\upsilon$ and $z \to x\,\zeta$ in the first term of (4.7) evaluated on the squares in the $x = \pm A$ plains, and also the replacements $x \to y\,\xi$ and $z \to y\,\zeta$ in the second term of (4.7) evaluated on the squares in the $y = \pm A$ plains we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta[M^{\,ADM}] = -\frac{1}{16\pi} \Bigg[& \!\!\!\!\!\!\int\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{x \to \infty} \Big(x^2 \, \partial_x \left(\Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \right) n^x_{\pm} \Big) \, \mathrm{d}\upsilon \, \mathrm{d}\zeta \\ & + \!\!\!\!\!\!\int\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{y \to \infty} \Big(y^2 \, \partial_y \left(\Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \right) n^y_{\pm} \Big) \, \mathrm{d}\xi \, \mathrm{d}\zeta \Bigg] \,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

where $n^x_{\pm}$ and $n^y_{\pm}$ are scalars taking the values $n^x_{\pm} = \pm 1$ and $n^y_{\pm} = \pm 1$ on the squares in the $x = \pm A$ and $y = \pm A$ plains, respectively. Note that the replacements applied in the above integral transformations are analogous to the ones used in case of sequences of spheres, where the integrals formally are given over a unit sphere with angular coordinates θ and ϕ ranging through their usual intervals. In both cases with the help of these sort of integral transformations the determination of limits of integrals may be replaced by investigation of limits of integrands.

In particular, taking finally into account the relation

$$\Delta[\widehat{N}^2] = (\Delta[\widehat{N}])^2 + 2\,{}^{(A)}\widehat{N}\,\Delta[\widehat{N}] \,, \tag{4.9}$$

along with (3.5) applied for $\Delta[\widehat{N}]$ and (3.2) applied for ${}^{(A)}\widehat{N}$, we get that each of the terms $x_i\,\Delta[\widehat{N}]$, $x_i^2\,(\partial_{x_i}\Delta[\widehat{N}])$ and $x_i\,(\partial_{x_i}{}^{(A)}\widehat{N})$ appearing in the integrand of (4.8) is at most of order $\mathcal{O}(|\vec{x}|^{-1})$. This, in turn, implies that the limits exist and they all vanish which verifies that $\Delta[M^{\,ADM}] = 0$.

4.2 The center of mass

Rephrasing (4.2), by using integrals over cubical domains, we get that the center of mass can be given by the flux integral

$$M^{\,ADM} d_l = \frac{1}{16\pi} \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{\infty} \Big\{ x_l \, [\, \partial_k h_{kj} - \partial_j h_{kk} \,] - \big[\, h_{kj}\, \delta^k{}_l - h_{kk}\, \delta_{lj} \,\big] \Big\}\, n^j \mathrm{d}C \,. \tag{4.10}$$

Taking now into account the consequences of (4.3)

$$\Delta[\, h_{kj} \,] = \delta_{kz} \delta_{jz}\, \Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta[\, h_{kk} \,] = \Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \tag{4.11}$$

a direct calculation, consisting of steps analogous to the ones applied in the previous subsection, yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta[M^{\,ADM} d_l] &= \frac{1}{16\pi} \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{\infty} \Big\{ x_l \Big[\, \partial_k (h_{kj} - {}^{(A)}h_{kj}) - \partial_j (h_{kk} - {}^{(A)}h_{kk}) \,\Big] \\
&\qquad\qquad - \Big[\, (h_{kj} - {}^{(A)}h_{kj})\, \delta^k{}_l - (h_{kk} - {}^{(A)}h_{kk})\, \delta_{lj} \,\Big] \Big\}\, n^j \mathrm{d}C \\
&= \frac{1}{16\pi} \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{\infty} \Big\{ x_l \, [\, \partial_k (\Delta[h_{kj}]) - \partial_j (\Delta[h_{kk}]) \,] - \big[\, \Delta[h_{kj}]\, \delta^k{}_l - \Delta[h_{kk}]\, \delta_{lj} \,\big] \Big\}\, n^j \mathrm{d}C \\
&= \frac{1}{16\pi} \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{\infty} \Big\{ -x_l \Big[\, \partial_x \, (\Delta[\widehat{N}^2])\, \vec{n}^{\,x}_{\pm} + \partial_y \, (\Delta[\widehat{N}^2])\, \vec{n}^{\,y}_{\pm} \,\Big] \\
&\qquad\qquad + \big[\, \delta_{lx}\, \vec{n}^{\,x}_{\pm} + \delta_{ly}\, \vec{n}^{\,y}_{\pm} \big]\; \Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \Big\} \mathrm{d}C \\
&= -\frac{1}{16\pi} \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{\infty} \Big\{ \Big[\, x_l\, \partial_x (\Delta[\widehat{N}^2]) - \delta_{lx}\, \Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \,\Big]\, \vec{n}^{\,x}_{\pm} \\
&\qquad\qquad + \Big[\, x_l\, \partial_y (\Delta[\widehat{N}^2]) - \delta_{ly}\, \Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \,\Big]\, \vec{n}^{\,y}_{\pm} \Big\} \mathrm{d}C \,.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Accordingly, for the x-component of the deviation $\Delta[M^{\,ADM} d_l]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta[M^{\,ADM} d_x] &= -\frac{1}{16\pi} \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{\infty} \Big\{ \Big[\, x\, \partial_x (\Delta[\widehat{N}^2]) - \Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \,\Big]\, \vec{n}^{\,x}_{\pm} + \Big[\, x\, \partial_y (\Delta[\widehat{N}^2])] \,\Big]\, \vec{n}^{\,y}_{\pm} \Big\} \mathrm{d}C \\
&= -\frac{1}{16\pi} \Bigg[\oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{x \to \infty} \Big\{ \Big[x^3\, \partial_x (\Delta[\widehat{N}^2]) - x^2\, \Delta[\widehat{N}^2] \Big]\, n^x_{\pm} \Big\}\, \mathrm{d}\upsilon\, \mathrm{d}\zeta \\
&\qquad\qquad + \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{y \to \infty} \Big\{ \Big[y^3\, \partial_y (\Delta[\widehat{N}^2]) \Big]\, n^y_{\pm} \Big\}\, \xi\, \mathrm{d}\xi\, \mathrm{d}\zeta \Bigg]
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

hold.

Taking now into account (4.9), along with the relations $n^x_+ = -n^x_- = 1$ and $n^y_+ = -n^y_- = 1$, in virtue of (3.2), (3.5) and the Regge-Teitelboim condition (3.8), it

follows that either of the terms $x^2\Delta[\widehat{N}^2]$, $x^3(\partial_x\Delta[\widehat{N}^2])$, $y^3(\partial_y\Delta[\widehat{N}^2])$ and $x_i^2\,(\partial_{x_i}{}^{(A)}\widehat{N})$ in the integrands, is at most of order $\mathcal{O}(|\vec{x}|^{-1})$. This, in turn, implies, as above, that the pertinent limits exist and they vanish as we intended to show.

In virtue of the relations,

$$\Delta[M^{\,ADM}d_y] = -\frac{1}{16\pi}\left[\fint_{-1,-1}^{1,1}\lim_{x\to\infty}\left\{\left[x^3\,\partial_x(\Delta[\widehat{N}^2])\right]n_\pm^x\right\}\upsilon\,\mathrm{d}\upsilon\,\mathrm{d}\zeta + \fint_{-1,-1}^{1,1}\lim_{y\to\infty}\left\{\left[y^3\,\partial_y(\Delta[\widehat{N}^2]) - y^2\,\Delta[\widehat{N}^2]\right]n_\pm^y\right\}\mathrm{d}\xi\,\mathrm{d}\zeta\right] \tag{4.14}$$

and

$$\Delta[M^{\,ADM}d_z] = -\frac{1}{16\pi}\left[\fint_{-1,-1}^{1,1}\lim_{x\to\infty}\left\{x^3\,\partial_x(\Delta[\widehat{N}^2])\,n_\pm^x\right\}\zeta\,\mathrm{d}\upsilon\,\mathrm{d}\zeta + \fint_{-1,-1}^{1,1}\lim_{y\to\infty}\left\{y^3\,\partial_y(\Delta[\widehat{N}^2])\,n_\pm^y\right\}\zeta\,\mathrm{d}\xi\,\mathrm{d}\zeta\right], \tag{4.15}$$

arguments, analogous to the one applied above, can be used to show the vanishing of the y- and z-components of the deviation $\Delta[M^{\,ADM}d_l]$.

4.3 The linear momentum

Consider now the linear momentum determined by the flux integral

$$P_i^{ADM} = \frac{1}{8\pi}\fint_\infty\left[\,K_{ij} - h_{kj}\,K^l{}_l\,\right]n^j\mathrm{d}C\,. \tag{4.16}$$

In verifying that the individual components of $\Delta[P_i^{ADM}]$ each vanish it is rewarding to rephrase first the term $K_{ij} - h_{ij}\,K^l{}_l$ in (4.16) in terms of the new variables we introduced. In doing so we get, in virtue of (2.4)–(2.5), that

$$K_{ij} = \boldsymbol{\kappa}\,\widehat{n}_i\widehat{n}_j + [\widehat{n}_i\,\mathbf{k}_j + \widehat{n}_j\,\mathbf{k}_i] + \left(\mathring{\mathbf{K}}_{ij} + \tfrac{1}{2}\,\widehat{\gamma}_{ij}\,\mathbf{K}^l{}_l\right), \tag{4.17}$$

and

$$K^l{}_l = \boldsymbol{\kappa} + \mathbf{K}^l{}_l\,. \tag{4.18}$$

It is straightforward to see then that

$$K_{ij} - h_{ij}\,K^l{}_l = [\widehat{n}_i\,\mathbf{k}_j + \widehat{n}_j\,\mathbf{k}_i] + \left(\mathring{\mathbf{K}}_{ij} + \tfrac{1}{2}\,\widehat{\gamma}_{ij}\,\mathbf{K}^l{}_l\right) - \left\{\widehat{\gamma}_{ij}\,\boldsymbol{\kappa} + (\widehat{\gamma}_{ij} + \widehat{n}_i\widehat{n}_j)\,\mathbf{K}^l{}_l\right\}, \tag{4.19}$$

and, by applying (4.4), that

$$\Delta[K_{ij} - h_{ij}\, K^l{}_l] = \delta_{iz}\, \Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_j] + \delta_{jz}\, \Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_i] - \tfrac{1}{2}\, \widehat{\gamma}_{ij}\, \Delta[\mathbf{K}^l{}_l] - \delta_{iz}\delta_{jz}\, \Delta[\widehat{N}^2\, \mathbf{K}^l{}_l]\,. \quad (4.20)$$

It follows then that for the individual components of $\Delta[P_i{}^{ADM}]$ the relations

$$\Delta[P_x{}^{ADM}] = \frac{1}{8\pi} \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{\infty} \Big\{ -\tfrac{1}{2}\, \widehat{\gamma}_{xx}\, \Delta[\mathbf{K}^l{}_l]\, \vec{n}^{\,x}_{\pm} - \tfrac{1}{2}\, \widehat{\gamma}_{xy}\, \Delta[\mathbf{K}^l{}_l]\, \vec{n}^{\,y}_{\pm} + \Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_x]\, \vec{n}^{\,z}_{\pm} \Big\}\, \mathrm{d}C \quad (4.21)$$

$$\Delta[P_y{}^{ADM}] = \frac{1}{8\pi} \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{\infty} \Big\{ -\tfrac{1}{2}\, \widehat{\gamma}_{yx}\, \Delta[\mathbf{K}^l{}_l]\, \vec{n}^{\,x}_{\pm} - \tfrac{1}{2}\, \widehat{\gamma}_{yy}\, \Delta[\mathbf{K}^l{}_l]\, \vec{n}^{\,y}_{\pm} + \Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_y]\, \vec{n}^{\,z}_{\pm} \Big\}\, \mathrm{d}C \quad (4.22)$$

$$\Delta[P_z{}^{ADM}] = \frac{1}{8\pi} \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{\infty} \Big\{ \Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_x]\, \vec{n}^{\,x}_{\pm} + \Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_y]\, \vec{n}^{\,y}_{\pm} - \Delta[\widehat{N}^2\, \mathbf{K}^l{}_l]\, \vec{n}^{\,z}_{\pm} \Big\}\, \mathrm{d}C \quad (4.23)$$

hold, where $\mathbf{k}_i\, \widehat{n}^i = 0$ and $\widehat{\gamma}_{ij}\, \widehat{n}^i = 0$ had also been used.

In verifying that the components of $\Delta[\vec{P}^{\,ADM}]$ vanish—besides the replacements $y \to x\,\upsilon$ $z \to x\,\zeta$, and $x \to y\,\xi$ $z \to y\,\zeta$ on the $x = \pm A$ and $y = \pm A$ surfaces, respectively—the transformations $x \to z\,\xi$ and $y \to z\,\upsilon$ have also to be performed on the $z = \pm A$ surfaces since the integrands there, as opposed to the previous two cases, are not identically zero. By applying the corresponding integral transformations we get from (4.21) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta[P_x{}^{ADM}] = -\frac{1}{16\pi} \Bigg[& \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{x\to\infty} \left(\widehat{\gamma}_{xx}\, n^x_{\pm} \left\{ x^2 \Delta[\mathbf{K}^l{}_l] \right\} \right) \mathrm{d}\upsilon\, \mathrm{d}\zeta \\ & + \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{y\to\infty} \left(\widehat{\gamma}_{xy}\, n^y_{\pm} \left\{ y^2 \Delta[\mathbf{K}^l{}_l] \right\} \right) \mathrm{d}\xi\, \mathrm{d}\zeta \\ & - 2 \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{z\to\infty} \left(n^z_{\pm} \left[\left\{ z^2\, \Delta[\widehat{N}]^{(A)}\mathbf{k}_x \right\} + {}^{(A)}\widehat{N} \left\{ z^2\, \Delta[\mathbf{k}_x] \right\} \right] \right) \mathrm{d}\xi\, \mathrm{d}\upsilon \Bigg]\,. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Taking then into account the fall off conditions in (3.5) and (3.7), along with the one satisfied, in virtue of (3.1), by ${}^{(A)}\mathbf{k}_x$, we get that all the terms in braces are at most of order $\mathcal{O}(|\vec{x}|^{-1})$ which verifies that $\Delta[P_x{}^{ADM}]$ vanishes.

As the terms in (4.22) are similar to those in (4.21), a completely analogous argument applies to the y-component of $\Delta[P_i{}^{ADM}]$.

To show that z-component, $\Delta[P_z{}^{ADM}]$, does also vanish note first that (4.23) can

be given as

$$\Delta[P_z^{ADM}] = \frac{1}{8\pi}\Bigg[\oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square\,\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{x\to\infty}\Big(n_\pm^x \Big[\Big\{x^2\,\Delta[\widehat{N}]\,{}^{(A)}\mathbf{k}_x\Big\} + {}^{(A)}\widehat{N}\,\big\{x^2\,\Delta[\mathbf{k}_x]\big\}\Big]\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\upsilon\,\mathrm{d}\zeta$$
$$+ \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square\,\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{y\to\infty}\Big(n_\pm^y \Big[\Big\{y^2\,\Delta[\widehat{N}]\,{}^{(A)}\mathbf{k}_y\Big\} + {}^{(A)}\widehat{N}\,\big\{y^2\,\Delta[\mathbf{k}_y]\big\}\Big]\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\xi\,\mathrm{d}\zeta$$
$$- \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square\,\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{z\to\infty}\Big(n_\pm^z \Big[\Big\{z^2\,\Delta[\widehat{N}^2]\,{}^{(A)}\mathbf{K}^l{}_l\Big\} + {}^{(A)}\widehat{N}^2\,\big\{z^2\,\Delta[\mathbf{K}^l{}_l]\big\}\Big]\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\xi\,\mathrm{d}\upsilon\Bigg]\,. \tag{4.25}$$

Now, by taking into account the fall off conditions listed in relations (3.5)–(3.7), along with those satisfied, in virtue of (3.1), by ${}^{(A)}\mathbf{k}_x$, ${}^{(A)}\mathbf{k}_y$ and ${}^{(A)}\mathbf{K}^l{}_l$, we get again that all the terms in braces are at most of order $\mathcal{O}(|\vec{x}|^{-1})$ which verifies that $\Delta[P_z^{ADM}]$ vanishes as we desired to show.

Note that, as expected, in verifying that the physical ADM mass and linear momentum are equal to the ADM mass and linear momentum of the superposed Kerr-Schild black holes, no use of the Regge-Teitelboim conditions had to be made.

4.4 The angular momentum

Consider, finally, the angular momentum determined by the flux integral

$$J_i^{ADM} = \frac{1}{8\pi}\oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square\,\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{\infty}\,[\,K_{kl} - h_{kl}\,K^m{}_m\,]\,\epsilon_i{}^{jk}x_j\,n^l\mathrm{d}C\,. \tag{4.26}$$

It follows immediately that

$$\Delta[J_i^{ADM}] = J_i^{ADM} - {}^{(A)}J_i^{ADM} = \frac{1}{8\pi}\oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square\,\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{\infty}\,\Delta[\,\widetilde{J}_{il}\,]\,n^l\,\mathrm{d}C\,, \tag{4.27}$$

where $\Delta[\widetilde{J}_{il}] = \Delta\,[\,K_{kl} - h_{kl}\,K^m{}_m\,]\,\epsilon_i{}^{jk}x_j$.

By a direct calculation, consisting of steps analogous to the ones applied in the previous subsection in evaluating $\Delta[K_{ij} - h_{ij}\,K^l{}_l]$ in (4.20), the relations

$$\Delta[\,\widetilde{J}_{xl}\,] = y\,\Big[\,\Delta[\widehat{N}\,\mathbf{k}_l] - \delta_{lz}\,\Delta[\widehat{N}^2\,\mathbf{K}^m{}_m]\,\Big] - z\,\Big[\,\delta_{lz}\,\Delta[\widehat{N}\,\mathbf{k}_y] - \tfrac{1}{2}\,\widehat{\gamma}_{ly}\,\Delta[\mathbf{K}^m{}_m]\,\Big] \tag{4.28}$$

$$\Delta[\,\widetilde{J}_{yl}\,] = z\,\Big[\,\delta_{lz}\,\Delta[\widehat{N}\,\mathbf{k}_x] - \tfrac{1}{2}\,\widehat{\gamma}_{lx}\,\Delta[\mathbf{K}^m{}_m]\,\Big] - x\,\Big[\,\Delta[\widehat{N}\,\mathbf{k}_l] - \delta_{lz}\,\Delta[\widehat{N}^2\,\mathbf{K}^m{}_m]\,\Big] \tag{4.29}$$

$$\Delta[\,\widetilde{J}_{zl}\,] = x\,\Big[\,\delta_{lz}\,\Delta[\widehat{N}\,\mathbf{k}_y] - \tfrac{1}{2}\,\widehat{\gamma}_{ly}\,\Delta[\mathbf{K}^m{}_m]\,\Big] - y\,\Big[\,\delta_{lz}\,\Delta[\widehat{N}\,\mathbf{k}_x] - \tfrac{1}{2}\,\widehat{\gamma}_{lx}\,\Delta[\mathbf{K}^m{}_m]\,\Big] \tag{4.30}$$

can be seen to hold.

It is then straightforward to verify that

$$\Delta[J_x^{ADM}] = \frac{1}{8\pi} \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{\infty} \Big\{ \Big[y\, \Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_l] + \tfrac{1}{2}\, z\, \widehat{\gamma}_{xy}\, \Delta[\mathbf{K}^m{}_m] \Big]\, \vec{n}^{\,x}_{\pm} + \Big[y\, \Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_y] + \tfrac{1}{2}\, z\, \widehat{\gamma}_{yy}\, \Delta[\mathbf{K}^m{}_m] \Big]\, \vec{n}^{\,y}_{\pm} - \Big[y\, \Delta[\widehat{N}^2\, \mathbf{K}^m{}_m] + z\, \Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_y] \Big]\, \vec{n}^{\,z}_{\pm} \Big\}\, \mathrm{d}C \tag{4.31}$$

from which—by applying the integral transformations already used several times in the previous subsections, on the individual $x_i = \pm A$ plains—we get

$$\Delta[J_x^{ADM}] = \frac{1}{8\pi} \Bigg[\oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{x\to\infty} \Big\{ x^3 \Big[\upsilon\ \Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_l] + \tfrac{1}{2}\, \zeta\, \widehat{\gamma}_{xy}\, \Delta[\mathbf{K}^m{}_m] \Big]\, n^x_{\pm} \Big\}\, \mathrm{d}\upsilon\, \mathrm{d}\zeta + \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{y\to\infty} \Big\{ y^3 \Big[\Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_y] + \tfrac{1}{2}\, \zeta\, \widehat{\gamma}_{yy}\, \Delta[\mathbf{K}^m{}_m] \Big]\, n^y_{\pm} \Big\}\, \mathrm{d}\xi\, \mathrm{d}\zeta - \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{z\to\infty} \Big\{ z^3 \Big[\upsilon\, \Delta[\widehat{N}^2\, \mathbf{K}^m{}_m] + \Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_y] \Big]\, n^z_{\pm} \Big\}\, \mathrm{d}\xi\, \mathrm{d}\upsilon \Bigg]\,. \tag{4.32}$$

Taking now into account (4.9), along with the relations $n^x_+ = -n^x_- = 1$ and $n^y_+ = -n^y_- = 1$, and also the boundedness of the components of $\widehat{\gamma}_{ij}$ and that of the coordinates ξ, υ, ζ, in virtue of (3.2)–(3.4), (3.5)–(3.7) and the Regge-Teitelboim condition (3.8)–(3.10), it follows that either of the terms involved by the integrands, is at most of order $\mathcal{O}(|\vec{x}|^{-1})$ which verifies the vanishing of $\Delta[J_x^{ADM}]$.

In virtue of the use of analogous terms in $\Delta[\,\widetilde{J}_{xl}\,]$ and $\Delta[\,\widetilde{J}_{yl}\,]$ a completely analogous argument can be seen to apply to the y-component of $\Delta[J_i^{ADM}]$.

Finally, $\Delta[J_z^{ADM}]$ can be evaluated as

$$\Delta[J_z^{ADM}] = -\frac{1}{16\pi} \Bigg[\oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{x\to\infty} \Big\{ x^3 \big[\, \widehat{\gamma}_{xy} - \upsilon\, \widehat{\gamma}_{xx}\, \big]\, \Delta[\mathbf{K}^m{}_m]\, n^x_{\pm} \Big\}\, \mathrm{d}\upsilon\, \mathrm{d}\zeta + \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{y\to\infty} \Big\{ y^3 \big[\, \xi\, \widehat{\gamma}_{yy} - \widehat{\gamma}_{yx}\, \big]\, \Delta[\mathbf{K}^m{}_m]\, n^y_{\pm} \Big\}\, \mathrm{d}\xi\, \mathrm{d}\zeta - 2 \oint\!\!\!\!\!\!\square_{-1,-1}^{1,1} \lim_{z\to\infty} \Big\{ z^3 \Big[\xi\, \Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_y] - \upsilon\, \Delta[\widehat{N}\, \mathbf{k}_x] \Big]\, n^z_{\pm} \Big\}\, \mathrm{d}\xi\, \mathrm{d}\upsilon \Bigg]\,. \tag{4.33}$$

From this, by making use of the fall off and Regge-Teitelboim conditions, (3.5)–(3.10), and by an argument that has already been applied several times above, the vanishing of $\Delta[J_z^{ADM}]$ can be inferred.

Putting all the results of the previous subsections together we get the desired verification of Theorem 1.

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to Piotr Chruściel, Andor Frenkel, Jan Metzger, Christopher Nerz, Harald Pfeiffer, Bob Wald and Jeff Winicour for helpful comments. Thanks are due to the Albert Einstein Institute in Golm for its kind hospitality. This work was also supported in parts by the NKFIH grant K-115434.

References

[1] Bartnik R (1986) *The mass of an asymptotically flat manifold*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **39** 661-693

[2] Baumgarte T W and Shapiro S L (2010) *Numerical relativity*, (Cambridge University Press)

[3] Bowen J M and York J W (1980) *Time-asymmetric initial data for black holes and black-hole collisions*, Phys. Rev. D **21** 2047-2056

[4] Choquet-Bruhat Y: *General relativity and Einstein's equations*, Oxford University Press Inc., New York (2009)

[5] Chruściel P T (1986) *A remark on the positive energy theorem*, Class. Quant. Grav. **3** L115-121

[6] Chruściel P T, Corvino J and Isenberg J (2011) *Constructions of N-body initial data sets in general relativity*, Commun. Math. Phys. **304**, 637-647

[7] Garat A and Price R H (2000) *Nonexistence of conformally flat slices of the Kerr spacetime*, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 124011

[8] Kerr R P and Schild A (1965) *Some algebraically degenerate solutions of Einstein's gravitational field equations*, Proc. Symp. Appl. Math. **17** 199

[9] Kreiss H-O and Lorenz J: *Initial-boundary value problems and the Navier-Stokes equations*, (Academic Press, Boston, 1989), reprinted as *SIAM Classic* (2004)

[10] Kroon J A V (2004) Class. Quant. Grav. **21** 3237-50

[11] Lichnerowicz A (1944) *L'integration des Equations de la Gravitation Relativiste et le Probleme des n Corps*, J. Math. Pures Appl., **23**, 39-63

[12] York J W (1972) *Role of conformal three-geometry in the dynamics of gravitation*, Phys. Rev. Letters **28**, 1082-1085

[13] Rácz I (2016) *Constrains as evolutionary systems*, Class. Quant. Grav. **33** 015014 [see also Rácz I: arXiv:gr-qc/1412.0667, Rácz I (2015) Class. Quant. Grav. **32** 015006]

[14] Rácz I (2016) *A simple method of constructing binary black hole initial data*, arXiv:gr-qc/1605.01669

[15] Rácz I and Winicour J (2015) *Black hole initial data without elliptic equation*, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 124013